Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/677,493	YANG, GUANG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BAOQUOC TO	2162
I Participants: Status of Application: Allowance		
(1) <u>BAOQUOC TO</u> .	(3)	
(2) George Guang Yang (Pro se Applicant).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>July 30 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 2 and 6-7		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
/BAOQUOC TO/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 09/677,493

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant contacted examiner once again to request changes to the Examiner Amendment dated on 05/17/2009 which applicant did not want the change in the Interview Summary on July 29, 2010. The changes would be as follow: incorporating the allowed claim language of 6 and 7 into allowed claim 2 and changing the dependency of claims allowed 6 and 7 depending on claim 4. Applicants indicated by amending the language of claim 2 would capture invention entirely. Examiner also advised applicant by incorporating the language of claims 6 and 7 into claim 2, would made the new claim 2 more narrow than its original allowance claim 2. Applicant acknowledged the potential of claim narrowness; however, applicant desired to have this new amended claim 2.